



MONTGOMERY COUNTY FIRE AND RESCUE SERVICE POST INCIDENT ANALYSIS

Date of Incident: February 6, 2007

Incident No. 07-0012095

Location: 309 Market St., Brookeville, MD

Magnitude: 2nd Alarm

Safety

Were any fire/rescue personnel injured? There were six (6) firefighter injuries. Three were treated on the scene by EMS Sector, three were transported by ambulance to Montgomery General Hospital.

Could the injuries have been avoided? Five were from slipping on icy surfaces and falling and were difficult to avoid. One injury was from fall through the flooring of the front porch and more closely evaluating the front porch condition could have avoided this injury.

Were all safety SOPs and regulations enforced? Yes.

Welfare

Were fire/rescue personnel provided with food and drink? Yes, by Canteen 4.

Was adequate shelter provided for fire/rescue personnel? Yes, Bus 27 and a Ride-On bus were utilized.

Was dry clothing provided for fire/rescue personnel? No.

Were crews relieved by fresh crews on a regular and frequent basis? Yes.

Building, Vehicle and Topography

What construction or design features contributed to the spread of fire and smoke? Wood, balloon framing did contribute to the fire spread.

Did the topography, type of fuel, characteristics or hazardous materials, affect control efforts? Yes, the house was on a steep street that was covered with ice which greatly hampered firefighter mobility and hoseline control.

POST INCIDENT ANALYSIS

Date/Location of Incident: 2/6/07, 309 Market St.

Page 2

Access

Did personnel or apparatus encounter any problems in gaining access? Limited street access and no vehicular access to the rear of the building, along with overhead electrical lines and tree branches hampered operations.

Weather

Did weather conditions contribute to the spread of fire, hazardous material, etc.? The extreme cold did impact operations but did not really contribute to the spread of fire.

Were fire/rescue personnel hampered in the performance of their duties? Yes, the icing conditions greatly impacted this incident.

Was access to the fire building or exposures limited? Yes, as mentioned above.

Suppression Agent Logistics

Was the water [or other suppression agent] supply adequate? Yes.

Were supplies, equipment, or materials needed and not provided in a timely manner? Yes.

Personnel

Were fire/rescue control personnel used effectively? Yes.

Were the proper support teams and agencies contacted? Yes.

Were these teams, agencies and personnel effective and responsive to Command? Yes, very much so, especially DPWT that assisted with sanding the icy areas.

POST INCIDENT ANALYSIS

Date/Location of Incident: 2/6/07, 309 Market St.

Page 3

Apparatus

Was the request for additional apparatus made in sufficient time to have a significant impact on mitigating the emergency? Yes, the RID and Task Force was requested by E402 immediately upon arrival. The Task Force was upgraded to a full 2nd alarm immediately upon the arrival of BC4 who was the first arriving command officer and the IC. Need for defensive operations determined early and implemented.

Did the apparatus function effectively? Yes.

Communications

Was the fire ground channel adequate? Yes.

Were the proper communications procedures followed? Yes.

Was there any problem communicating with apparatus outside of our jurisdiction? Slight problem initially with HC E51 but quickly corrected.

Was the communication network controlled to reduce confusion? Yes.

Did units, sectors, and Montgomery communicate effectively? Yes.

Were units, sectors and Montgomery available and receptive to Command communications? Yes.

Pre-Emergency Planning

Were the pre-fire or other plans needed on the scene? No.

Were they available on the scene? No.

Do they need to be updated? No.

POST INCIDENT ANALYSIS

Date/Location of Incident: 2/6/07, 309 Market St.

Page 4

Standard Operating Procedures

Were they used? Yes.

Were they adequate? Yes.

Do they need to be updated? No.

Organization

Was Command identified and maintained throughout the incident? Yes.

Communications? Yes.

Flags/Vests? No. Safety 1 had his Safety SCBA bag and the CP was marked by the green light. No other vests were used and should have been.

Was the fireground well organized? Yes. Sides A & C had command officers for each and there were 2 assigned Safety Officers. Defensive operations determined early and implemented.

Were the sectors used appropriate to the type and complexity of the incident? Yes.

Did the sector officers function effectively? Yes.

Accountability

Were actions taken to ensure personnel accountability? Yes, the RID company was also assigned the Accountability function and a PAR was done by command at about the 25 minute mark. All exterior operations, no IDLH.

Was the status of units, sectors and support personnel maintained?

Did personnel provide adequate feedback? Yes.

Was the incident continuously controlled and monitored? Yes, C200 and CS1 assisted very effectively with this function at the CP.

POST INCIDENT ANALYSIS

Date/Location of Incident: 2/6/07, 309 Market Street

Page 5

Strategy and Tactics

Were acceptable approaches and actions taken to control and resolve the emergency? Yes.

Did personnel, units, teams and officers execute tactics effectively? Yes.

Were any training needs identified? Just that the initial attack line should have been a larger line for the amount of fire encountered. Also, need to reiterate to all personnel to keep water flowing through hoselines in extreme cold conditions to prevent lines from freezing.

Overall Analysis of Operations

Good/Bad; Why: Overall very good operations and tactical approach in difficult weather and access conditions. No injuries directly related to the fire itself, mostly due to extreme cold and icing conditions. Heavy fire conditions upon arrival and balloon framing greatly contributed to rapid fire spread in building thus making interior attack not feasible. Large diameter hoselines, Blitz-Fire guns and AT18 ladder pipe used to control large volume of fire. Once controlled, re-con teams supervised by Safety Officers entered building to evaluate overhaul needs and establish safe work zones. Once done, interior crews deployed for final overhaul and extinguishment.

Critique General Comments: (include here a breakdown of Command, including Sector officers):

Overall good operation with appropriate support functions provided. BC4 (Hamilton) as IC, C200 (Rothenhoefer) and CS1 (Edens) assisted at CP. BC5 (Darwick) with Side A Operations, C17 (Sutton) with Side C Operations, Safety 1 (Keyser) and Capt. Fitch both as Safety Officers. Water Supply not a problem, Capt. Henrie (RS3) as RIC leader with RS3, T3 and E251 as RIC. EMS1 (Stottlemeyer) as EMS/ Re-hab Sector officer with A408, M49 and A289 assigned to him, along with CT4, Bus 27 and Ride-On bus.